

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 091

EA 022 884

AUTHOR Chapman, Patrick  
TITLE Survey of School Administrator Preparation Programs, 1990.  
INSTITUTION Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver.  
PUB DATE Oct 90  
NOTE 24p.  
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Administrator Attitudes; \*Administrator Education; \*Educational Assessment; \*Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; \*Management Development; Professional Education

IDENTIFIERS \*Colorado

## ABSTRACT

A goal of the Colorado administrator survey is to provide Colorado institutions of higher education and the state board of education with information for the continued improvement of administrator education programs. Of 67 participants, 42 surveys were used. Respondents made assessments concerning major areas of their preparation programs. Major components were basic management, leadership, decision making, problem solving, human relations, personnel administration, curriculum and instruction assessment, and resource utilization. Components and subcomponents were rated on relevance to current position and adequacy of preparation. Well over 70 percent of the respondents indicated each component as relevant to their position. Over 80 percent rated 6 of the 29 components as adequate, including planning and accepting responsibility. Seven components received less than 60 percent adequate ratings, including recruiting, screening, and selecting competent staff members. A table and outline of results are included. The evaluation instrument is appended. (EJS)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

SA

ED340091

# 1990 SURVEY OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- ☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Bassett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SA 022884  
ERIC  
Full Text Provided by ERIC

**1990 SURVEY OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR  
PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

**Prepared by  
Patrick Chapman, Research Analyst  
Planning and Evaluation Unit**

**Judith C. Burnes, Executive Director  
Planning and Evaluation Unit**

**Dan Stewart, Assistant Commissioner  
Office of Management Services**

**Gene Campbell, Executive Director  
Professional Education and Teacher Certification**

**Patricia Pease, Senior Consultant  
Professional Education and Teacher Certification**

**William T. Randall  
Commissioner of Education  
State of Colorado**

**October 1990**

## COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Thomas M. Howerton, Chairman ..... Colorado Springs  
Fifth Congressional District

Sybil S. Downing, Vice Chairman ..... Boulder  
Member at Large

Gladys S. Eddy ..... Fort Collins  
Fourth Congressional District

Warren E. "Gil" Gilbertson ..... Steamboat Springs  
Third Congressional District

Ed Lyell ..... Boulder  
Second Congressional District

Art Pansing ..... Denver  
First Congressional District

Patricia M. Hayes ..... Englewood  
Sixth Congressional District

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Administrator Sample .....	2
1990 State Results .....	7
Appendix A: 1990 Survey Form	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Colorado administrator survey is sponsored jointly by the Colorado Department of Education and the Colorado Council of Deans of Education. The implementation of this survey is required by the Teacher Certification Act of 1975 as amended in 1988. A goal of the project is to provide feedback to institutions from former students regarding their administrator programs.

The administrator survey was implemented for the first time in 1989. Survey questions were based upon the State Board of Education standards for the approval of school administration preparation programs. Due to the relatively small size of this year's sample, the content of this report has been abbreviated from that of last year. However, additional information and/or specific feedback pertaining to an individual institution's preparation program is available upon request.

The majority of administrators who completed the survey felt that components in the major areas of their administrator preparation programs were relevant to their current position. There was only one exception. Less than 80 percent of the administrators believed that the component "administering provisions of negotiated employment contracts" was relevant to their current positions. In relation to whether administrators found their preparation to be adequate or not adequate, the distribution of responses was variable. Components where the highest rate of administrators found preparation to be adequate were:

- Ensuring that legal responsibilities of the school are being met and safeguarding legal rights of students, staff, parents.
- Using findings of research and exemplary practice in rational decision-making process.
- Articulating the role and purpose of education in contemporary society.
- Accepting responsibility for results of the decision-making process.

The components for adequacy of preparation with the lowest frequency of administrator response were:

- Working effectively with diverse community groups and involving them in meaningful activities related to the school and educational program.
- Administering provisions of negotiated employment contracts.
- Assessing relationship between cost and effectiveness.
- Identifying, utilizing resources available to schools; including state, federal categorical aid and foundation grants.

Over 80 percent of the administrators rated 6 of the 29 components as adequate in preparation; 60 to 79 percent rated 16 components adequate; and 40 to 59 percent rated 7 of the components adequate.

## INTRODUCTION

This report presents the 1990 results of the survey of Colorado administrators, mandated by the Teacher Certification Act of 1975 as amended in 1988. The purpose of the survey is to provide Colorado institutions of higher education and the Colorado State Board of Education with information for the continued improvement of administrator education programs.

The survey form was developed by the Colorado Department of Education in collaboration with a committee of higher education professors of school administration. Questions were based on the State Board of Education standards for approval of school administration preparation programs. The administrator survey was implemented for the first time in 1989. Due to the relatively small size of this year's sample, the content of this report has been abbreviated from that of last year. However, additional information and/or specific feedback pertaining to an individual institution's preparation program is available upon request.

Raters were asked to make assessments concerning major areas of their administrator preparation programs. Each component was rated in relation to relevancy to current position and adequacy of preparation. In addition, the respondent was given an opportunity to indicate specific aspects of an area which were not adequately covered. The major components rated were basic management, leadership, decision-making and problem-solving, human relations, personnel administration, curriculum and instruction assessment, and resource utilization. Opinions were also recorded with regard to practicum/internships, areas of study insufficiently covered or not included at all, overall strengths and weaknesses of the preparation and limitations of the program.

1990  
ADMINISTRATOR SAMPLE

Survey Distribution and Response Rate

In spring 1990, survey forms were sent to 120 Colorado administrators. The sample consisted of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, and assistant principals who received their administrative endorsements in 1988, 1989, or 1990. A total of 67 survey forms were returned, yielding a 55.8 percent response rate. Twenty-five of the 67 survey forms were eliminated from the database for the following reasons: 14 forms indicated a program completion year prior to 1988; 2 indicated an out-of-state college or university and; 9 indicated both an out-of-state college or university and a completion date prior to 1988. Analyses were conducted based on a sample of 42 administrators.

Colorado Institution Attended: Administrator Preparation

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
University of Northern Colorado	8	19.0%
Colorado State University	5	11.9
University of Colorado-Boulder	1	2.4
University of Colorado-Colorado Springs	7	16.7
University of Colorado-Denver	3	7.1
University of Denver	7	16.7
Western State College	<u>11</u>	<u>26.2</u>
	42	100.0



## 1990 STATE RESULTS

### ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

The survey form was developed by the Colorado Department of Education with input from a committee whose members were deans of Colorado institutions of higher education. Survey questions included were based on the standards for Approved Programs of Professional Education adopted by the State Board of Education.

Respondents to the survey were asked to rate components in seven major areas of their administrator preparation program on two different scales. Each one was based on a two-point scale relating to: a) relevancy of each component to current administrator position and b) adequacy of preparation for each component in the major areas (as shown below). Results are presented as percent of respondents.

<u>Relevance to Current Position</u>		<u>Adequacy of Preparation</u>	
Relevant	Not Relevant	Adequate	Not Adequate

In addition, each respondent was granted the opportunity to identify any specific aspects of their programs which they felt were not adequately covered. Administrator opinions were collected regarding practicum/internships, areas of study insufficiently covered or not included at all, overall strengths and weaknesses of their preparation and limitations of the preparation program.

The following pages summarize the results of those respondents who received their administrator endorsements at an institution of higher education in Colorado.

Relevance to Current Position. The majority of administrators who completed the survey felt that all components of the major areas of their administrators preparation program were relevant to their current position. Well over 80 percent of respondents indicated each of the components as relevant with only one exception. Seventy-four percent of the respondents felt that "administering provisions of negotiated employment contracts" was relevant to their job, leaving 26 percent who did not.

Adequacy of Preparation. With regard to whether administrators found their preparation to be adequate or not adequate, the distribution of responses was more variable. Ninety-five percent of the respondents felt that they were adequately prepared in ensuring that legal responsibilities of the school are being met and safeguarding legal rights of students, staff, and parents. Over 80 percent of the administrators rated 6 of the 29 components as adequate in preparation. The 6 were:

- Ensuring that legal responsibilities of the school are being met and safeguarding legal rights of students, staff, parents.
- Planning.
- Accepting responsibility for results of the decision-making process.

- Planning, utilizing physical facilities in an effective manner.
- Using findings of research and exemplary practice in rational decision-making process.
- Articulating the role and purpose of education in contemporary society.

Sixteen of the components received an adequate rating by between 60 percent and 79 percent of the sample. There were 7 components in which less than 60 percent of the administrators rated their preparation as adequate. Only 26 percent felt adequately prepared with regard to identifying and utilizing resources available to school; including state, federal categorical aid, and foundation grants. Forty-six percent of respondents felt that they had been adequately prepared to assess the relationship between cost and effectiveness in curriculum and instruction. The 7 components receiving a less than 60 percent adequate rating were:

- Recruiting, screening, selecting competent staff members.
- Administering provisions of negotiated employment contracts.
- Assessing the relationship between cost and effectiveness.
- Identifying, utilizing resources available to schools; including state, federal categorical aid and foundation grants.
- Articulating financial needs of the schools to staff, parents, citizens: to show relationships between program needs, financial needs, total student development.
- Getting people to work together to achieve organization's goals in the most effective and efficient manner.
- Bringing about change in the organization, it's programs, activities and people.

Table I  
1990  
Summary: State Results  
Ratings of Administrator Preparation Programing

	Relevance to Position		Adequacy of Preparation	
	<u>Relevant</u>	<u>Not Relevant</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Not Adequate</u>
<b>BASIC MANAGEMENT:</b>				
Planning.	97%	3%	80%	20%
Budgeting.	90	10	66	34
Implementing organizational objectives.	100	--	67	33
Evaluating progress toward achievement of goals and effectiveness of programs.	100	--	68	32
Organizing work, people, resources, instructional programs.	100	--	71	29
Directing the work of others.	100	--	68	32
<b>LEADERSHIP:</b>				
Articulating the role and purpose of education in contemporary society.	97	3	82	18
Ensuring that legal responsibilities of the school are being met and safeguarding legal rights of students, staff, parents.	97	3	95	5
Understanding, planning, implementing procedures to achieve educational accountability.	100	--	62	38
Bringing about change in the organization, its programs, activities, people.	100	--	58	42
Developing, maintaining an effective and efficient management information system suitable to the needs of the school or district.	97	3	60	40
<b>DECISION-MAKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING:</b>				
Identifying decisions that must be made, or problems that need to be solved.	100	--	77	23
Getting people to work together in arriving at rational decisions.	100	--	75	25
Using findings of research and exemplary practice in rational decision-making process.	95	5	85	15
Accepting responsibility for results of the decision-making process.	97	3	83	17

# Summary: State Results

	Relevance for your position		Adequacy of preparation	
	<u>Relevant</u>	<u>Not Relevant</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Not Adequate</u>
<b>HUMAN RELATIONS:</b>				
Managing or resolving conflict so organization's goals are achieved.	100%	--%	60%	40%
Getting people to work together to achieve organization's goals in the most effective, efficient manner.	100	--	57	43
Working effectively with diverse community groups and involving them in meaningful activities related to the school and educational program.	98	2	50	50
<b>PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION:</b>				
Recruiting, screening, selecting competent staff members.	92	8	58	42
Supervising, evaluating effectiveness of staff.	100	--	68	32
Administering provisions of negotiated employment contracts.	74	26	51	49
<b>CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION ASSESSMENT:</b>				
Assessing effectiveness and appropriateness of the scope and sequence of the curriculum.	97	3	69	31
Assessing relationship between cost and effectiveness.	97	3	46	54
Assessing learning abilities, disabilities of students.	95	5	60	40
<b>RESOURCE UTILIZATION:</b>				
Identifying, utilizing resources available to schools; including state, federal categorical aid and foundation grants.	85	15	26	73
Planning, utilizing physical facilities in an effective manner.	98	2	80	20
Developing, administering local school budgets.	85	15	63	37
Articulating financial needs of the schools to staff, parents, citizens: to show relationships between program needs, financial needs, total student development.	97	3	56	43
Utilizing auxiliary business services that are available to the district in an effective manner. (i.e., transportation, food services, purchasing, data processing).	92	8	63	37

## 1990 STATE RESULTS

### ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM EVALUATION: OPINIONS

#### Completed Supervised Practicum/Internship for Principalship or Superintendency As Part of Preparation Program

79%	Yes
21%	No

#### If Yes to Above Question, was Practicum at the Appropriate Level to Your Current Assignment?

100%	Yes
--%	No

#### Effectiveness of Practicum/Internship

3%	Not adequate
24%	Moderately adequate
73%	Adequate

#### Was the Practicum/Internship Waived or Substituted by the Preparing Institution Based Upon Previous Administrative Experience?

31%	Yes
69%	No

---

About 34 respondents (81 percent) took the opportunity to make additional comments relative to the last three questions of the survey. The following are general statewide summaries for these questions:

#### List any areas of responsibility or functions of your current position that were absent or insufficiently covered in your preparation programs for school administrators.

The areas most frequently mentioned pertained to interpersonal skills and activities: teacher/staff evaluations, discipline, conflict resolution, difficult parents, and staff conflict and management. Other areas mentioned include curriculum development, school budgeting and finance, school athletics and activities, accountability accreditation, law, and special needs students.

List the strengths of your preparation program (excluding the internship).

School law and school finance were by far the most frequently mentioned strengths of programs. Other areas mentioned included: business, time, and personnel management, instructors --including current administrators, theory, relations with staff and community, and small study groups and classes.

List the limitations of your preparation program.

Many respondents commented that their programs "included too much theory, not enough practical experience," outdated information, and professors who were out-of-touch. Some asked for longer internships and apprenticeships. Other limitations mentioned were: curriculum, facilities, teacher supervision, non-certificated employees, and a lack of in-depth coverage of topics.

# STATE OF COLORADO

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
201 East Colfax Avenue  
Denver, CO 80203  
FAX: (303) 830-0793



William T. Randall  
Commissioner of Education  
Richard A. Laughlin  
Deputy Commissioner

March 15, 1990

Dear School Administrator:

In order to fulfill the requirements of the Teacher Certification Act of 1975 (22-60-114), a survey was developed to aid in the collection of information related to administrator preparation programs in the state of Colorado.

This survey is being sent to those of you who received an administrative endorsement since 1988 and who are currently principals, assistant principals, superintendents or assistant superintendents in Colorado school districts. The results will be provided to Colorado institutions of higher education for their use in improving administrator preparation programs. The survey form is anonymous to protect the confidential nature of your response.

We hope you will assist us in improving Colorado administrator preparation by completing and returning the enclosed survey, by April 15, 1990.

Please call Patrick Chapman (866-6882) of the Department of Education if you have questions about the survey. Again, thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

William T. Randall  
Commissioner

WTR/JB/sb

enclosure

## 1990 ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

1. Which of the following best describes your position?

- ☐ (a) Superintendent
- ☐ (b) Assistant or associate superintendent
- ☐ (c) Principal
- ☐ (d) Assistant or associate principal
- ☐ (e) Other \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many years have you worked as a school administrator, including the current year?

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Please indicate the college or university at which you completed your school administration program which prepared you for your present position.

- ☐ (49) University of Northern Colorado
- ☐ (50) Colorado State University
- ☐ (70) University of Colorado - Boulder
- ☐ (71) University of Denver
- ☐ (74) University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
- ☐ (75) University of Colorado - Denver
- ☐ (99) Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. In what year did you complete this administrator preparation program?

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Which endorsement best describes your preparation program?


- ☐ (a) Elementary Principal
- ☐ (b) Middle, Junior High Principal
- ☐ (c) Secondary School Principal
- ☐ (d) Superintendent of Schools
- ☐ (e) Multiple endorsements, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Please indicate the level which best describes your current assignment.

- ☐ (a) District office
- ☐ (b) Elementary school
- ☐ (c) Junior high or middle school
- ☐ (d) Secondary school
- ☐ (e) Junior/senior high school
- ☐ (f) K-12 or multiple level

7. Please indicate the size of your school district.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (a) 300 or fewer pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> (d) 1,201 to 6,000 pupils  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (b) 301 to 600 pupils   | <input type="checkbox"/> (e) 6,001 to 25,000 pupils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (c) 601 to 1,200 pupils | <input type="checkbox"/> (f) Over 25,000 pupils     |

COE - DARI FORM CLEARANCE			RECOMMENDED
FORM NO.	CDE-459		
UNIT	Planning and Evaluation		
APPROVAL	through August 1990		

Please return this form by April 15, 1990  
to the Colorado Department of Education,  
Planning and Evaluation, 201 East Colfax,  
Denver, CO 80203.



## STANDARDS

Listed below are components in major areas of administrator preparation programs. Using the rating scales provided, please indicate how important you feel each component is for your present assignment and how adequate you feel that your administrator preparation program prepared you for this area. Identify in the last column any specific aspects that were not adequately covered in your program.

	Relevance for your position		Adequacy of preparation		Specific aspects of this area that were not adequately covered
	<u>Relevant</u>	<u>Not Relevant</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Not Adequate</u>	
<b>1. BASIC MANAGEMENT:</b>					
a. Planning.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Budgeting.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Implementing organizational objectives.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
d. Evaluating progress toward achievement of goals and effectiveness of programs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
e. Organizing work, people, resources, instructional programs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
f. Directing the work of others.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
<b>2. LEADERSHIP:</b>					
a. Articulating the role and purpose of education in contemporary society.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Ensuring that legal responsibilities of the school are being met and safeguarding legal rights of students, staff, parents.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Understanding, planning, implementing procedures to achieve educational accountability.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
d. Bringing about change in the organization, its programs, activities, people.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
e. Developing, maintaining an effective and efficient management information system suitable to the needs of the school or district.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
<b>3. DECISION-MAKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING:</b>					
a. Identifying decisions that must be made, or problems that need to be solved.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Getting people to work together in arriving at rational decisions.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Using findings of research and exemplary practice in rational decision-making process.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
d. Accepting responsibility for results of the decision-making process.	_____	_____	_____	_____	

# STANDARDS (con't)

	Relevance for your position		Adequacy of preparation		Specific aspects of this area that were not adequately covered
	<u>Relevant</u>	<u>Not Relevant</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Not Adequate</u>	
<hr/>					
4. HUMAN RELATIONS:					
a. Managing or resolving conflict so organization's goals are achieved.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Getting people to work together to achieve organization's goals in the most effective, efficient manner.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Working effectively with diverse community groups and involving them in meaningful activities related to the school and educational program.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
5. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION:					
a. Recruiting, screening, selecting competent staff members.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Supervising, evaluating effectiveness of staff.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Administering provisions of negotiated employment contracts.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
6. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION ASSESSMENT:					
a. Assessing effectiveness and appropriateness of the scope and sequence of the curriculum.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Assessing relationship between cost and effectiveness.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Assessing learning abilities, disabilities of students.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
7. RESOURCE UTILIZATION:					
a. Identifying, utilizing resources available to the schools; including state, federal categorical aid and foundation grants.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
b. Planning, utilizing physical facilities in an effective manner.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
c. Developing, administering local school budgets.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
d. Articulating financial needs of the schools to staff, parents, citizens: to show relationships between program needs, financial needs, total student development.	_____	_____	_____	_____	
e. Utilizing auxiliary business services that are available to the district in an effective manner. (i.e., transportation, food services, purchasing, data processing).	_____	_____	_____	_____	

## OPINIONS

1. Did you complete a supervised practicum or internship for the principalship or superintendency as a part of your preparation program?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, was this practicum at the level appropriate to your current assignment?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, rate the effectiveness of this experience.  
Not adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Moderately adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_
2. Was the practicum or internship waived or substituted by the preparing institution based upon previous administrative experience?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
3. List any areas of responsibility or functions of your current position that were absent or insufficiently covered in your preparation programs for school administrators.
4. List the strengths of your preparation program (excluding the internship).
5. List the limitations of your preparation program.